



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 400
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,923	07/25/2000	Stuart D. Green	JTT006-00	7085

7590 05/05/2006
JEFFREY VAN MYERS
P.O. BOX 130
DRIFTWOOD, TX 78619

EXAMINER
REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/624,923	Applicant(s) GREEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher A. Revak	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11 and 13-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11,13-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/25/00 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to claims 21-23 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. It is argued by the applicant that either Landfield or Dutta do not teach "selectively [transfer] to the [firewall host system] at least a portion of the received [email] even if the protection rule allows transfer of the received [email] and that the direction of transfer is "opposite" to that used to download the protection rule.

The examiner respectfully disagrees, in figure 1 of Landfield, it is shown of three different firewall hosts, denoted #26, #28, and #30. An update from firewall host system #26 is initiated and transferred to firewall host system #28, see column 3, lines 40-46. It is unclear how this is argued by the applicant that it is the "opposite" since one host firewall system initiates transmission of information to another host firewall system since the prior art does indeed teach of this transmission.

3. The applicant further argues that it is not disclosed by either Landfield or Dutta of "selectively creating.....a second [alias] in response to the [the portion of the email that we have assumed was sent by the firewall host system]".
4. As per claims 21 and 22, the examiner cannot find support for the argued limitations in the claims. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., selectively creating...) are not recited in the rejected claims.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As per claim 23, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments. The teachings of Landfield disclose of providing updates, or "creation" of changes as is claimed by the applicant, to the alias databases. The firewall host system manipulates the information in the alias database by adding or deleting the information in the alias database, or edits the existing alias information, see column 3, lines 40-62. The steps performed by Landfield of adding, deleting, editing, and updating are all forms of "creation" of changes as argued by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield et al, U.S. Patent 5,632,011 in view of Dutta et al, U.S. Patent 6,826,694.

As per claims 21-23, it is disclosed by Landfield et al of a communications security system and method to prevent transfer of selected communication transactions from a public (untrustworthy) network to a private (trustworthy) network comprising a firewall host (server), connected to the public (untrustworthy) network, that maintains a

database of protection rules, each of which, when applied to a communication transaction, identifies that communication transaction to be a respective one of the selected communication transactions and a firewall (portal), connected between the public (untrustworthy) network and the private (trusted) network. The firewall (portal) selectively transfers the database of protection rules from said firewall host (server) via said public (untrustworthy) network; receives a communication transaction from the public (untrustworthy) network for transfer to the private (trustworthy) network (col. 3, line 35-67 and as shown in Figure 1). The examiner is interpreting the firewall (portal) as software operating on the firewall host (server). The teachings of Landfield et al fail to disclose of applying each of the protection rules to the received communication transaction and prevents the transfer of the received communication transaction to the private network if a protection rule identifies the received communication transaction to be a respective one of the selected communication transactions. It is disclosed by Dutta et al of applying each of the protection rules to the received communication transaction and prevents the transfer of the received communication transaction to the private network if a protection rule identifies the received communication transaction to be a respective one of the selected communication transactions (col. 4, lines 58). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply prevention of communications if they match a protection rule. The teachings of Dutta et al recite motivation for the use of preventing communications if they match a protection rule by disclosing high resolution of packet filtering is providing that not only filters header information, but additionally payload

information (col. 1, lines 11-14 and col. 2, lines 7-9). It is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the teachings of Landfield et al could have been modified to allow the firewall to filter data to prevent communications if they match a protection rule as is disclosed by Dutta et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1,2,4-11, and 13-20 are allowed.

Conclusion


8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR

April 30, 2006

CHRISTOPHER REVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER


4/30/06